

THE  
CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

Vol. I.

June, 1822.

No. 4.

A BRIEF REVIEW OF DOCTRINES.

THE candid inquirers for truth, who have had sufficient opportunity to examine the statements of the different views of the plan of salvation, through a crucified Saviour, which appeared in the first and second numbers of this *Intelligencer*, are probably prepared to form an impartial opinion of their relation to each other, and to Christianity in general. That the reader may judge with greater accuracy concerning the justness of this review of those doctrines, he is requested to look them over again, and then give it a careful re-perusal.

The doctrine of Election and Reprobation, or Calvinism, included in the 8th and 9th pages, was followed by remarks, which we hope will also be again carefully perused.

The HEART of the scheme is, That God did from all eternity decree the salvation of *some* of the fallen family of Adam, viz. *his elect*, without any foresight of faith or good works; and did also fore-ordain the *endless misery* of *all others*, the *non-elect*, though no more guilty and hell-deserving, than the elect, for the display of his own glory, and the highest good of the universe. This plan precludes the possibility of the salvation of all those who are finally lost. Their endless misery was as certain, as the execution of God's own purpose. These observations do not misrepresent the system, or present it in unfair colors. We know that our Calvinist neighbors complain of unfairness, and pretend that their doctrine does not preclude the possibility of the salvation of all men. If their complaints originate in ignorance, we pity and forgive them; if they are designed to deceive the simple and unsuspecting, we abhor their conduct. We are asked, why we should appeal to Calvin's Institutes, in proof of their doctrine, in preference to modern

defenders of the same scheme. Our answer is, Because no man is a *Calvinist* that does not embrace the fundamental principles of *his system*. Besides, modern theologians are so crafty, and introduce the same sentiments, in so many different ways, that it would require far more labor to detect the sophistry of their reasoning, than to expose the cruelty of the doctrines they defend. But to silence, if possible, the cavils of some, and the chattering complaints of many, that their sentiments are misrepresented, I will here offer an extract from the great reformer of orthodoxy, in New-England, the Abbot Prof. in the Andover Institution.

“It is then altogether unreasonable to object to the declaration in the Catechism, that God has “*fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass* ;” that is, that his *purpose* extends to *all events* in his administration.” “These remarks are as applicable to the *purpose* of God, which is called *election*, as to any other.” “God must have eternally designed to do just what he does in the present life, and what he will do at the judgment day ; that is, he must have *designed to save that same number of individuals*.” “Now God actually saves a definite number of individuals. He saves that *definite number*, and *no more or less*. He must then have *determined to do it*.” “*Divine grace* in the conversion of sinners is *distinguishing* ; in other words—of those who are *equally unworthy* of favor, and *equally deserving of punishment*, some are renewed and others are not.” “*Divine grace actually makes a difference* among those who are *equally sinful*, renewing *some* and *not others*,” &c. “That act of *divine grace* which, so far as the *conduct* of sinners is concerned is *wholly unconditional*, is the first formation of a holy character,” &c. Dr. Wood’s letters to Dr. Ware, pages 154—158.

Can any Christian be so blind as not to discover, that even according to Dr. Wood’s refined, and in some measure reformed, or rather disguised system of doctrine, he still maintains that God designed and *determined to save a certain definite number of individuals*, and *no more* ; that they were *no less* deserving of punishment than those he did not mean to save ; and that *this salvation* was, as far as respected their *conduct wholly unconditional*, a sovereign act of God ? And will any creature that is properly called ra-



tional, in view of this doctrine, pretend, that those sinners might be saved whom God from eternity *determined not to save*? Will they maintain that God *fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass*, and governs *all events* according to his *sovereign will*, and yet that *more or less* might be saved than the *certain definite number* whom he *unconditionally* converts? But we will not perplex the reader with the shifts and turns of sophistry, learned in the Theological Seminaries of the Calvinian stamp. The doctrine,

“ — is a monster of so frightful mein,  
“ As to be hated, needs but to be seen.”

Every reader will doubtless object to the real doctrine of election and reprobation, as taught in the *schools*, and for the soundest reasons. But is there no danger of adopting another system, rather more plausible, but equally as fallacious. If we object to the doctrine because it asserts the salvation of a *part* of the world, wholly independent of *their works*, and leaves the others to perish forever in their wickedness, we should probably adopt the second plan, viz. That *Salvation is possible for all men, and certain to none*. (Page 13.) This scheme maintains that sinners are not saved because of any anterior decree of God, or because it was any more his pleasure to save a part of the fallen family of Adam, than the whole; but because *some* are *obedient* to the commands of God, while others remain rebels. Their *obedience* will be *rewarded* with everlasting bliss, or salvation from endless woe. But who can subscribe to this doctrine, when dismantled, and expressed without its clerical disguise? Is not this a salvation according to *works*? If we object to Calvinism because it maintains the salvation of a part, *not* according to works, we must, in order to be consistent, in this scheme, hold that it *is* according to the works of the saved. The path is extremely narrow, and we must go directly back or forward. If we say, God saves *some* sinners through Jesus, and it is wholly of him, why object to its being *decreed*? Is it not far more consistent with the character of God, to suppose he would act according to a prior purpose, especially, in a work of so much consequence as the salvation of sinners, than that he would not? And would it be *less his work*, because he *de-*

*terminated* to do it? If a part of mankind are saved, and God alone saves them, it must be because he was pleased to save *them only*; for he will do all his pleasure. On the other hand, if sinners are not saved, but punished forever, for not obeying according to their *ability*, it at least supposes that they had *ability* to affect their own salvation: which is the same as to save themselves. If the difference between this system and the other, be not because God works according to his decrees, neither because *some* men are saved and not all men, it must be on account of the greater *partiality* in Calvinism than in Arminianism. Then let us endeavor to ascertain the impartiality of the latter. Can it be on any other ground, than that God is *indifferent* to the salvation of men, after making it *possible* for all? If we say, God works in the saved, both to will and to do, to *submit* and to *obey*, then the question is fair, Would *they* have been saved, more than others, if he had not thus supernaturally influenced them? and is not the work as really his own, as though it had been decreed? Now, if Jehovah knew when he gave men existence that they would be endlessly miserable, unless he did supernaturally influence them to obey and be saved, and yet also *knew* that he would *not* thus save all of them, did he not also know that they would be endlessly miserable? and could he know they would not be saved, and yet make it possible for them to be saved? or, in other words, was it possible for that to fail, which infinite wisdom knew was certain to take place? If God knew that some individuals would be saved, he also knew *what* individuals; and if he knew their salvation was certain, he knew they could not finally be lost; and if he did not know it, when it takes place, God will know more than he did before! And further. If God had any design respecting his children, he designed them for the dooms with which they will meet, or he will be frustrated in his purpose. Will any one pretend that God designed men for that, which he knew was impossible? or will they contend that an event was possible, which God knew would never take place? This reasoning drives us to the following point, viz. Either to ascribe the salvation of *some* to God, according to his prior purpose, and the endless misery of the others to causes which they have no ability to prevent; or, what is worse,



we must acknowledge that God was *indifferent* in their salvation, having made it possible for all ; and left it to sinners to save themselves according to their *works*, or be lost forever ! If we are dissatisfied with this plan also, let us appeal to the third scheme, pages 50 and 51, and candidly decide, whether that is any more compatible with the real character of God.

That system differs in nothing essential, from the last, in relation to the saved ; but contends that to punish or torment the wicked endlessly, would be the height of *cruelty*, as it could not benefit them ; and to suppose that the righteous would be made more happy, by their sufferings, is to make them demons, and not saints. This doctrine maintains the *final destruction* of the wicked, which is surely more merciful than either of the other schemes. But is it not also deficient ? Was it not as easy for God to save all men, as a part, and is he *full of mercy* in the destruction of that capacity which is susceptible of endless happiness ? Is it not, at most, a kind of *negative benevolence*, or, a not doing worse ? If God be as merciful, as he is powerful, will he destroy forever, those whom he might restore, if so pleased ? If we say, he will not prevent the free exercise of their moral faculties, may it not be asked, whether it would any more destroy the agency of *all*, if God should save them by his grace, than it would that of a *part* ? If God can subdue some sinners, and not infringe on their agency, he also could all others. With him nothing is impossible which he is disposed to perform.

That He, who can speak, and it is done ; with whom the conversion and salvation of the whole world, is no more, comparatively, than the resurrection of Lazarus, should prefer the final destruction of many of his rational family to their restoration and ultimate bliss, is a supposition equally opposed by philosophy and revelation. The transition is easy and the consequence natural, to pass from this, to the *fourth*, and only remaining plan, viz. *The final restoration of all sinful intelligences to ultimate holiness and happiness*, and to ascribe the work wholly and universally to the Almighty Saviour, who is equally good unto all, and whose tender mercies are over all his works. Whether all events take place according to the predetermination of infinite

wisdom and goodness, is no longer a matter of controversy, if we are once convinced of the Paternal character of God, and of the equality of his design in the great plan of redemption. In this scheme, the *justice* of God is no less displayed than his mercy ; since justice as loudly demands the uprightness and obedience of the creature, as any other divine perfection. If God can be just, and the Saviour of *some*, he surely would not be less just, in the salvation of *all* who were equally sinful.

Until the majority of Christians are freed from the soul-killing horrors of the doctrine of endless misery, that legitimate descendant of papal superstition and cruelty, it is hardly worth our while to be particular, concerning the certainty of immediate happiness at death. The question, which like Aaron's rod, swallows up all others, is, Will the misery of God's rational offspring be strictly endless ? And are we not extremely happy, in being able to answer it in the negative ? No reasonable argument can be raised against us. It is perfectly consonant to the benevolent desires of all rational creatures. No being in the universe can be injured, in the least, by that administration of the divine government, whereby the equal felicity of all men is forever secured. As well might we individually complain, because millions of others are now rejoicing in the light of the sun. The doctrine can by no means increase the depravity of the community generally, since it does not deny the faithful administration of rewards and punishments. It perfectly harmonizes with the noblest conception of the divine attributes, is the obvious sentiment of revelation concerning the will of our Almighty Father, has the cheerful concurrence of all holy beings, and is shown to be of divine original, by being the subject of almost every prayer which is devoutly offered to the throne of Grace. Should we hear a man pray that *all men* might *not* be saved, we should consider it the index of a cruel and unrenewed heart. Then shall we blush to acknowledge our belief in that system, which is so honorable to the character of God, exalting to the mediation of Jesus, perfect in the administration of justice and mercy, and conformable with the highest felicity of all created intelligences ? Nothing but a palpable misunderstanding of the system can be the cause of that unabated



ing zeal, by which most *limitarian* professors are prompted to exhibit such violent opposition.

We do charitably believe that thousands of our brethren, of different denominations, do not, at heart, oppose this doctrine, though a mistaken prudence prevents their being its professors.

---

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

MR. EDITOR—I have been for many years a believer in the final restoration of all men to holiness and felicity. This doctrine I received, and have contended for, as far as I was able, on the ground of the mediatorial office of Jesus Christ, who is called “the Saviour of the world.” I considered our Lord in this character, because the scriptures so frequently speak of his “reconciling all things to himself,” and subjecting the world to his righteous authority. The preachers of universalism, whom I sometimes heard, used to argue against a limited salvation, from the scriptural declarations, that Christ died for all, and that it was the divine purpose, through his mediatorial work, to bring “every knee to bow and every tongue to confess that Jesus is Lord, to the glory of God the father.” They likewise contended, in opposition to those who maintain that all opportunity for salvation closes with the present life, that the empire of Christ extends into a future world, or at least that no evidence to the contrary appears in the Bible. In vindication of the idea, that wicked men may be restored to holiness and happiness in another life, I have heard Universalist preachers cite the promises made to Sodom and her daughters, that they should return to their former estate.

I had always supposed that these views of the doctrine in question were correct and scriptural. I had believed that repentance was a necessary process of mind, a mean to effect the sinner’s salvation. Nor was it till lately, that I learned, that these ideas are considered by many as absurd, and that a different scheme is, by some, openly defended. According to the plan here alluded to, Jesus Christ saves those only who are made acquainted with his doc-

trine, by which they are delivered from all groundless fears of future misery, and made exceedingly happy in the prospects that lie before them. But as the number, who gain this knowledge in the present state is very small ; and as millions live and die, ignorant of Christ and his doctrine, and religion, he cannot be said to be their Saviour, and of course, the doctrine of the universality of his grace, of his dying for, and being the Saviour of all men is unfounded. You may perhaps conclude, that this deficiency is balanced by extending the dominion of Christ into the future world. This, however, does not seem to be the case. When the abettors of this scheme are asked concerning the state of such as live and die in impenitence ; they say that death delivers them from all iniquity, and they pass at once into glory and felicity ; and they rest the proof of this theory upon this declaration, " he that is dead is freed from sin," and consequently, say they, from misery or punishment. This doctrine, if I understand it, makes repentance unnecessary, it knows nothing of a moral, disciplinary process, by which to subject the creature to the dominion of the Saviour ; and it appears to exclude the agency of Jesus Christ from the salvation of all, who are not, in this life, made acquainted with his doctrine.

I have said, Mr. Editor, that my information, that this doctrine was believed, was recently received ; and you may wish to know what impression it made upon my mind. I will confess to you, that for reasons already advanced, it struck me with surprise. I found, that if this doctrine were true, we ought never again to call Christ the Saviour of the world, or of all men ; and that the work of subjecting the sinner to God, and transforming his soul into the divine image, is not to be attributed to the mediator, but is to be considered as the result of a physical law of our nature. Death delivers us from sin and misery. Surely, thought I, if this be the doctrine of the bible, I am grossly ignorant of that sacred book ; " I have not so learned Christ ;" and if to believe in this theory is to be a universalist, I am not of that order. Men may call me what they please ; perhaps I may be unable to say what I AM ; I can however say what I am NOT ; I am not a universalist. **EUMENES.**



The editor is not disposed to reply to "Eumenes," or enter into a controversy concerning the disputable point which he has so calmly introduced ; but to prevent, if possible, all unnecessary replies in future, would offer a few suggestions, which he hopes will not be misconstrued. The reader, including friend "Eumenes," is requested to pause for a moment, and see if we are not liable to labor under mistakes, in relation to each other's faith. Has not Eumenes misunderstood those Universalists, who, he thinks, do not extend the dominion of the Saviour into the future world ? Notwithstanding they deny all misery in that state, for crimes committed here, do they not also believe that all men are raised immortal, by virtue of their relation to Jesus as Mediator ? Do they not mean that those who repent, believe and are obedient, are *specially saved*, and have their reward in this life ; that such as enjoy the means without profiting by them, suffer punishment, compared with the others, and, in addition to similar physical evils, endure guilt or mental misery, rendering their condition much more dreadful than that of infants and idiots ? Do they not contend that a man who has abused the gospel and received his punishment, stands in the same relation to Jesus, as Mediator and Saviour, in a future state, that *he* does, who never in this world heard of his name ? If any of my brethren contend that men will be holy and happy at death, *independent* of their relation to Jesus, "the resurrection and the life," their creed saps the foundation of our holy religion. But if they duly appreciate the value of repentance for sin, faith in the Lord Jesus, and hope in immortality, and yet do not believe that repentance will be necessary when all propensity to evil is done away, or faith be useful when knowledge supercedes it, or that hope will be needful when all men are made immortal in the resurrection, we shall be indulgent towards them, till their fundamental error is fairly exposed. We think the Universalists are under the highest obligation to exercise gentleness and forbearance towards each other, while they are so violently opposed by those, who surely are of a different faith, and we trust, of a different spirit.

## A BELIEVER TO HIS FRIEND.

You gave me a little sketch in your letter of a reformation in religion, which has taken place in your part of the country. I hope it is a reformation of mind and morals, as well as the tongue. Religion is a sober rational thing, when it comes from the exercises of a pure and good heart, and never fails to contribute to the happiness and respectability of the possessor. But a certain kind of noise and rabble is, what some crazy heads call religion, to which I shall leave others to give a name. In most instances, it is destitute of common sense, and in many of order, decorum, and propriety. These, not possessing the spirit of true religion, are never able to exhibit the external graces of internal goodness. For the works of God, in nature and grace are all allied, the effect never belies the cause, however, hypocrisy may, for a single time counterfeit. And it is so proved by fact, that very few turn out to be sober, pious Christians, who take it up in a kind of sudden frenzy. These, we generally find to have been of bad habits, and loose and abandoned in their morals. Their zeal generally comes from some sudden conviction of guilt, grounded on a hope, that, by a few fervent exercises of the forms of piety, they shall be able to efface the memory of former faults and frauds, and secure to themselves a sanctity of character, under which iniquity may be practiced with more impunity. If attacked on any deception of character, they never fail to appeal to their zeal and piety for conclusive proof to the contrary, and strike up a very fervent discourse upon religious subjects. This, for the respects most people have for religion, puts others to silence, and they escape their just deserts.

If such people have any idea of a God, it must be that of a Jupiter, who makes mean obsequious deportment, in his creatures, a divine grace, who sees nothing in the shades of night, and dispenses his rewards and punishments at noon-day measured by deep groans, a haggard phiz or a long face. These are pieties, I hope you never have nor will embrace. And here I wish you particularly to remark, that, when superstition gets into the head, it makes a man a strange creature ; but when the holy spirit takes hold of



the heart, how humble it lays the soul at the foot of the cross, stripped of all the filthy rags of self-righteousness.

Real religion is an internal manifestation to the heart of good, and enables christians to know, from the testimony of the spirit, that they are disciples of the same Jesus, whom they profess. Following these manifestations of God in the mind, they are lead, in every day's path and every step of life, to proofs of new assurance of his providence, goodness and grace. These are the professors, who honor their religion through life, and give unquestionable evidence of the reality of their faith at the close of life.

Some people pretend to get religion, by inquiring of others, what it is? But it is an easy question to determine, if any one knows any thing about it, but those, who go to its author for their religion. The same Spirit, who introduced it into the world, must preserve it, if it be kept. By taking it from others, we have it loaded with the shackles of forms and ceremonies. If we take it from the throne of grace, we have it a pure and divine principle. God never withholds his holy spirit from those, who ask for it, and never gives it those, who simply talk about it.

What I have sketched is only the outline of character. If you would get and keep religion, I would not advise you, to go much to others, even ministers, to inquire what it is? But accustom yourself to the diligent reading of the revealed word, and, as often as doubts and difficulties arise, instead of inquiring the inventions of men, any farther than regards ancient rites and ceremonies, go in honest inquiry to the throne of grace, and, if you ask in sincere faith, you will never be denied all, which will be proper for you to know. If you do thus, while in the wilderness of this life, as oft as you are a thirst, smite the rock, which contains the waters of eternal life, with the rod of faith; a spring therefrom will never fail. It is needless for me to waste more of your time. If you have religion, I shall perhaps detain you from better occupation. If you have it not, it will be but a song to the ear and nothing addressed to the understanding.

PHILOS.

## ANOTHER BLIND GUIDE EXPOSED.

A man who undertakes to instruct the world by elaborate works upon the different Religious Systems, which have been embraced and defended, at different periods and places, and yet is so bigotted, as to see only the dark side of his subject, may, with propriety, be called, *a blind guide*. Such is the character of Mr. *Adams*, the author of the "Religious World Displayed," or, what is worse, he is a wilful calumniator. This will be evident to every reader, possessed of any generous feelings.

In displaying the doctrine of the *Universal Restoration*, as he calls it, Mr. *Adams* at first appears to be candid, and states the subject as it has been defended; but he soon introduces a cruel misrepresentation. Among many others, who have either embraced or favored the doctrine, he justly reckons *Oregon*, *Bishop Newton*, the learned *Petitpierre*, *Whiston* and the famous *Dr. Priestly*, *Chevalier Ramsay*, *Archbishop Tillotson*, *Dr. T. Burnet*, the pious *William Law*, *Dr. Hartley*, *Dr. Rust*, *Dr. Chauncey* and *Mr. Winchester*; the *Mennonites*, the harmless *Tunkers* and the *Shakers*. He allows that those who embraced the doctrine, in the first centuries, were by *Augustine*, called, the *merciful Doctors*.

As though determined to poison the feelings of his readers against this weight of character and talents, he impudently subjoins the following:

"Nor need we be surprised that libertines and *Atheists* hold it, (that God will save all men) and that they *strive* to bring others over to their opinions."

But who will not be surprised that a man of common sense should write in such a manner? Could insinuations be more unjust and calumnious?

How can an *Atheist*, who disbelieves in the existence of God, hold the doctrine of *Universal Restoration* through the Lord Jesus? Is it not the weakest insult on the talents of all readers, to pretend, that men who *do not* believe there is a God, are *striving* to convince others that God so loved the world, as to send his Son to save all sinners? The insinuation comes about as near the truth, as we should, to contend that Mr. *Adams* was not blinded by education or interest, but wrote after the manner of candid impartial



historians. This insinuation is no more consistent, than we should be in the suggestion, that a blind man, who did not believe there was any sun, was much engaged in convincing people that the sun shone on all men, the evil and the good. We are under the same obligation to believe him, as we should be, were he to assure us in the first place, that he never had any father, and then *strive* to make us believe that his father sent him to college, to strengthen and enlarge his capacities, that he might comprehend the amazing fact, that an *Atheist* did *not hold* that God loved the world! O, the power of superstition! O, the blindness of Priests!

Mr. Adams thinks there may have been some in all ages who may have embraced the doctrine at heart, but did not dare profess it for fear of persecution. That is doubtless correct; and by the way it shows, what experience would lead us to believe, viz. that the professors of the Universal Restoration have ever been persecuted, and also, that the believers in endless torments have been their *persecutors*. Let him have all the honor which the concession affords.

He pretends that *libertines* and men of *corrupt passions* embrace the doctrine. But should we not inquire, whether no men of corrupt inclinations have espoused *his* doctrine? Did the church believe in Universal Salvation during the dark ages of superstition, wickedness and cruelty? Does he not know that the precious doctrine of endless torments, was as dear to the Popes and Cardinals, as the apple of the eye? And while our hearts bleed at the thought, let us in justice to truth ask, for what pretence the Inquisition was established; why every engine of torture was invented to torment heretics? Was it the believers in endless misery who were thus destroyed? No, reader; not a crime has been left uncommitted, not a deception unpractised, and no cruelty untried, among the defenders of eternal unmerciful torments! Unsatisfied with threatening their fellow creatures with endless hell-torments in another world, they have invented all possible plans for tormenting them in this world; and in the light of the very flames by which they perished, these *holy defenders of Orthodoxy* have perpetrated crimes, at which Sodomites would blush. It is an eternal truth, and must be proclaimed, that those who have been

most tenacious for the doctrine of endless misery, have also been the only wilful and wicked persecutors of others. And at this time, we find the same spirit, in a high degree, among those who call *themselves* Orthodox, and others by the names, Libertines, Unitarians or Universalists.



[We do not publish the following letter as a mark of disrespect for our Methodist friends, generally, or because we suppose they would descend to such scurrility as it opposes. But as the writer of the letter was once a Methodist preacher and is frequently attacked by them in an unfair manner, we owe the publication to him as a manly defence. The Editor takes no part in the subject, and is wholly unacquainted with Mr. Shaw and the people of his circuit. We have reason to believe the letter substantially correct, till it is contradicted and disproved. We hope it will be a warning to others, to desist from unfair abuse of a doctrine they do not understand.]

#### LETTER TO REV. MR. SHAW.

DEAR SIR—I had the pleasure of attending your meeting on Sabbath evening, the 3d instant, and was much surprised to hear your statements made against those, that profess to believe in the *final salvation of all men*, without bringing to your aid any passages of Sacred Writ, to support assertions, made in a very bold and uncharitable, not to say, in an unchristianlike, spirit. When we hear a person, and especially, one who professes to be a preacher of that gospel which brings *glad tidings of great joy to all people*, condemn any system of doctrine, taught amongst men, we expect he will back his declarations by the scriptures of divine truth; and when he tells us that the doctrine of the final restoration of all things, “spoken by the mouth of all God’s holy prophets since the world began,” sprung from the bottomless pit; that it opens the floodgates of wickedness and all manner of sin and iniquity, without any qualification or explanation whatever, we must conclude that he is wholly unacquainted with the doctrine he condemns, or does it out of prejudice, and is vain enough to suppose that his hearers will take *his words for truth*. “Search the scriptures,” is an injunction of him “who spake as never man spake.” And what do they tell us? “Judge not, lest ye be judged,” is the language of the Saviour of the world, and he came *not to condemn, but to save the*



*world.* He told his disciples to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature;" and, by the gospel, we understand, GOOD NEWS—such as was preached by the angel to the shepherds. "Fear not, for, behold, I bring you *good tidings of great joy*, which shall be to ALL PEOPLE: for, unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." But the gospel has altered much since that day, if you preach it correctly; for you will have it to mean the *eternal misery* of at least one half of the human family. But you say, the doctrine of Universal Salvation is bad, because the most wicked and abominable profess to believe it! If all who profess to be christians, were really such, you might bring your argument to bear upon the doctrine of Universal Salvation. But did you never see or hear of a man, whom you thought to be bad, that did not profess to believe that doctrine? If not, have the candor to inform me for what purpose you have *society-meetings*, when nearly one half of the neighborhood are called together, to *accuse* or *acquit* a member? For what purpose are some of your quarterly meeting Conferences held, where letter after letter is read, deposition after deposition brought forward, from *one* to *twenty* or more witnesses called and examined, to *accuse* or *acquit*—who? why a *preacher* of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America! And for what are some of your brethren, not to say sisters, publicly *read out* of your society? For my part I have reason to suppose that all this is done on account of disorderly life and conversation, in those that are so dealt with. And if so, the Methodist doctrine sprung from the bottomless pit, according to your own theory, which you say is correct. You also observed that the wicked have *no hope*; but only an *expectation*. But for my part, I cannot conceive the difference between them, and had you have taken pains to have read the chapter following your text, you would have there found that they have *a hope*. But because their hope of happiness once disappoints them, does it follow of a certainty that it always will? even after they are brought to act from a different motive? If so, what encouragement have you to pray or preach? You prayed to God to convert souls the evening I heard you; and I hope you prayed in faith, for what is

not of faith is sin. But I presume there was none converted that night. Will you now give up, and say, I will pray no more. No, I am persuaded it is far from you so to think; but like Abraham of old, "who against hope believed in hope," still continue to pray for them. And I will appeal to the experience of every christian, if they did not once *expect* and *hope* for happiness in the things of the world and in sin; but they were disappointed; and if your reasoning is just, they are not christians now, and even you yourself must plunge the fiery gulf of eternal woe. If you are careful to examine, you will find that Solomon (whom you think to be a wise man in many respects) uses the words *hope* and *expectation*, as applied to both the righteous and the wicked. You also observed that it was a bad doctrine, for you never knew of a *reformation* under the preachers of it.' Now, sir, I would candidly ask you, what you understand, or would have your hearers understand, by a reformation? Is it to come together to worship God, with a zeal without knowledge? to make his house a place of confusion, and to conduct in such a manner as would put modesty to the blush? Is it to profess that religion which is "pure and peaceable," and at the same time, be engaged in quarrels and disputes? Is it to profess that religion which "thinketh no evil," and, at the same time, speak against, and tell every thing to hurt and defame those that are their professed brethren? Is it to profess that religion which "forgives the faults of others," and, at the same time, exaggerate them in every manner? Is it to profess that religion which teaches us "to love our enemies," and at the same time, evince to the world by our actions and words, that we hate, even, our brethren? Is it to profess that religion, which teaches us to pray to God in faith "for all men, that they may come to the knowledge of the truth," and, at the same time, to send, as far as in our power, a part of the human family to endless pain? If that is what you call a *reformation*, I believe you, when you say, you "never heard of one under a preacher of Universal Salvation," and I hope in God we may never have one of that description amongst us! I should be extremely sorry to have the time of our preachers spent, as well as that of others, in endeavoring to settle and adjust the difficulties



that have generally, grown out of what many have considered reformatations; such difficulties as make every sincere follower of Jesus Christ, weep. In proof of this assertion look at the Circuit on which you now are;\* ask those that now belong to the Methodist Society, and have for years, what they have to boast of, in all their reformatations. They may perhaps tell you, that they have some lasting monuments of it left behind, composed of hate, dissembling and discord; and one might with a degree of propriety suppose, (if he judged by their actions) that the people were Ishmaelites; for their hands are against every man, and every man's hand is against them; and they most certainly fulfil the following scripture, literally, which saith, "the father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother-in-law against her daughter-in-law, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law." This is too generally the picture presented us after what is commonly called a reformation. You likewise observed that the doctrine was not true, for the Psalmist said, "that the wicked should be turned into hell, with all the nations that forget God." Now, sir, if you will have the goodness to examine and see whom the Psalmist considered wicked—also, into what hell they were to be turned, you will find the passage very far from disproving Universalism. He expressly says, *all are wicked*, and that he was delivered from *the lowest hell*. If he was so delivered, can you say, the blood of Christ shall not cleanse from all sin? I think you cannot prove that the belief that "God is good to all, and his tender mercies over all his works," will make any of its professors worse than they were previous to believing it. It is an established principle among Methodists, and all other Christians, "that love begets love;" and if it is correct, the more love we discover in God, the more we love him; which is in unison with the words of Jesus Christ, that who had much forgiven, loved much; and the Scriptures inform us that "God is love." "And he that dwelleth in God dwelleth in love." But are we not deficient in that? do we always "reprove with all long-suffering," and search carefully for the beam that is in our own eye,

\* Livermore.

before we attempt to pluck a mote from the eye of our brother? And now, dear sir, I suggest for your consideration, whether Jesus requires of his followers to forgive, and even pray for their enemies? If so, will he wreak vengeance on *his*, to all eternity? He requires us to be like him: but in this case, we should be quite different. Are we not required, as preachers of the gospel of Christ, to preach him, and him only? "to know nothing save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." Reflect for a moment, that we are the professed ambassadors of Jesus, and it is our business to persuade men to be reconciled to God. Then, sir, do not condemn others for believing *that* for which *you* pray daily; nor think that the Universalists "are sinners above all that dwell in" the Methodist Church.

I am yours in the bonds of the gospel.

Rev. Mr. Shaw.

ASA BARTON.

Paris, Feb. 4, 1822.

#### DOCTOR PAYSON AND MR. STREETER.

"Woe unto you \* \* \* for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men;—neither suffer ye them that are *entering to go in*."

SAVIOUR.

"Stand by thyself, come not near to ME; for I am holier than thou."

HYPOCRITES.

"These are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day."

JEHOVAH.

"They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith THE LORD."

At a public meeting, for the avowed purpose of uniting Christians of all denominations, called the "Union Prayer-meeting," the writer went to a pew, in which he had previously been requested to take a seat, whenever he came to Dr. Payson's meeting, and as he was opening the door, a man from within suddenly reached forth his hand, and closed it, and, in a low voice, forbid his entering. On observing more closely he was found to be the Rev. Dr. Payson. Seeing there were but two in the pew, the writer thought he must have made a mistake; and after looking a minute, asked the Dr. if that was Mr. K's. pew; meaning, as every one must know, the pew which he occupied. Dr. Payson said, it was not. But it *was* the pew of which Mr.



K. hired a part, of the Doctor. By the invitation of one of Dr. Payson's church I took a seat in the next pew, in which sat a Methodist preacher, that was not too holy to sit with sinners. The meeting was very solemn and interesting, and was doubtless profitable, to all who were exercised by a right spirit. After the services were through, the Doctor voluntarily offered the following apology for his conduct, which gave rise to the conversation, of which the subjoined, is the substance. It was conceived most proper to put it down in the form of a dialogue, between Dr. Payson and Mr. Streeter.

Dr. Payson.—Mr. Streeter, I wish to explain to you my motives, in refusing you a seat in this pew. It is not because I have any thing against you *as a man*, but would wish to show you the same civility that I would any other person. But I must tell you in the fear of God, that I think you are deceived, and are leading others to eternal ruin; and that *your hands are stained with the blood of immortal souls*. I tell you this, Mr. Streeter, in the most serious and friendly manner, and not because I have any enmity towards you.

Mr. Streeter.—I thank you, sir, for your frankness, and will not question your sincerity; but I am unable to see how you can justify yourself for shutting the pew-door against me, for no better reason than because you *think I am deceived*. Why should that prevent your treating me with the civility you would another man? It would not injure you, for me to take a seat, as usual. It is a privilege which every decent person has a right to expect.

Dr. P.—You must know, sir, that I could not feel right to have a man at my elbow, which I knew would not join in the prayers of this meeting, but is directly opposed to them, and disposed to take every possible advantage of whatever is offered in prayer or exhortation.

Mr. S.—Dr. Payson, I wish to know who made you a judge of my disposition, and by what authority you say, I am directly opposed to your prayers. I am sorry to be under the necessity of contradicting you *in this house of God*; (pardon me for it, sir;) but I must do it, for I have joined in every prayer which has been offered in this meeting, as far as I understood it; and, God being my witness, I

have enjoyed myself extremely well, in devotional exercises. Now, sir, either your assertion or mine is true; and I am willing to meet you in the presence of our Judge and hear his decision concerning it.

Dr. P.—But how can we believe you sincere when you say you join with us in our prayers, when we know you labor to the utmost of your abilities to oppose every thing for which we pray?

Mr. S.—Dr. Payson, a moment's reflection will convince you of your mistake. You pray for the conviction, conversion and salvation of sinners; and are you authorized to say that I oppose you, and pray they may *not* be saved? No, sir; did you pray exactly opposite to what you now do, I should oppose you. You all pray for the very thing, which I believe the Saviour came to perform.

Dr. P.—But how can you pray for a reformation, when you preach against it, and lead your hearers to believe that men can be saved in their wickedness; and that a change of heart is unnecessary?

Mr. S.—Sir, I should be glad to know how you learned that I preach as you have asserted.

Dr. P.—Why, Mr. Streeter, all your hearers so understand you, and build their hopes of happiness on that false and ruinous delusion.

Mr. S.—When a man makes such statements, Dr. Payson, he ought to be able to support them. Your assertion is destitute of proof, and all my hearers will tell you so. None of them understand me to teach that men can be saved *in their wickedness*; and lest some, who occasionally come in, should misunderstand me, I frequently assert the contrary, and that I will not hold myself accountable for those who pervert the truth. Now, sir, I solemnly demand of you the evidence, that your assertions are true, instead of mine.

[Some of the Doctor's friends said that *every body* understood that I preached as he stated; but acknowledged that they did not know of any one who had ever *heard* me preach those things.]

Dr. P.—But you assert, unqualifiedly and frequently, that all men will be saved, do as they will; and how can your hearers draw any other conclusion, than that the



wicked are as safe as the righteous? Can you deny that you make these assertions in your preaching?

Mr. S.—Yes, sir, I can, and do, deny it; and furthermore tell you, that you cannot bring the man of good character that will say, he ever heard me make such assertions, either in this town or any other.

Dr. P.—Then you are very much misrepresented; for I am told you frequently do.

Mr. S.—No doubt of that, sir.

Dr. P.—Well, I hope you will not consider me your enemy, or in the least unfriendly to you, as a man; but as I said before, I believe you are deceived, and your hands are stained with the blood of precious immortal souls, and that you will find it so at last. I really consider you as being in the most dangerous situation of any man in this town. I will quote you a passage from the old Testament, which I think describes your situation.—“Because with lies you have made the hearts of the righteous sad, whom God has not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life.” I tell you plainly, sir, that you are making the hearts of the righteous sad, and I warn you of the final ruin to which you are exposing yourself and others. As a friend to your welfare, I pray you to renounce your doctrine and prepare yourself for the destinies of eternity.

Mr. S.—You will permit me to tell you, Dr. Payson, that you no more believe that we can alter the destinies of eternity, than I do; but that our final destination was unalterably fixed, in the *divine purpose*, before either of us existed. I am as willing to meet you in eternity, as in this world; and when we meet there, it will be a proper time to attend to the affairs which concern that state. Let us do every thing in its proper season, and, in the first place, do what belongs to time. You see how you have been misinformed concerning my sentiments, and you now have a fair opportunity to inform yourself. I should rejoice to meet you at any time and place you may please to appoint, either in public or private, and converse with you upon doctrinal points. As I want nothing but truth, I am willing to be examined by you, or any other minister in this town, and if you convince me of error, I will gladly renounce it. But I do not consider

it fair for you to refuse me the civilities you would show any other man, because you think I am wrong in my faith, and still refuse to meet me on equal ground and expose my errors. You will not pretend that you would have treated any other man in the house, as you have me. If you are friendly to me as a man, you will exert yourself to promote my welfare; and should you feel opposed to controversy, you may propose questions, and after giving me a fair opportunity to answer them, you may make remarks, and I will not reply.

Dr. P.—I do not wish to engage in a controversy with you; but I must tell you plainly, Mr. Streeter, that we view you as a *spy* among us, and disposed to make unfavorable remarks upon our performances. I presume I speak the feelings of every christian in this meeting, when I say you embarrass us, and injure our feelings, by coming among us; for we do not view you as a friend, or as having come to our meeting with any good intentions.

Mr. S.—The spirit of jealousy is as cruel as the grave; but you know, Dr. Payson, it torments those only who possess it. What makes you jealous I am a *spy*, and disposed to make unfavorable remarks? Have you heard of my speaking reproachfully of this prayer-meeting?

Dr. P.—We think you would be as likely to misrepresent us, as you were the Baptists. You crowded yourself into their meeting, which was intended for private *fasting and prayer*, and went off and represented them as being the worst people in town, and said you were ashamed you had been among them. And can you deny it, as you have other things?

Mr. S.—Yes, sir, I do deny your assertion, length and breadth, and call on you to support it, or acknowledge your error. I will tell you *what* I did say about the Baptists, and *why* I said it. But I would first observe, that it was not a private meeting, which I attended, nor did I crowd myself in among them. I asked a member of the Church if I was intruding upon them to be there, and he told me I was not; though none were permitted to speak, but the members. If I disturbed *their* meeting, it is for *them* to call me to an account. I called on a friend, immediately after the fast, and was asked how I was pleased with my meeting.



I told them I was *well pleased*; thought we had had a solemn, profitable meeting.

But, to try an experiment, I observed to them, that I did not know but I should hereafter be sorry I went among them; for I had heard some very bad stories about them, and if they were true, the Baptists were the worst people in town—I hoped, however, there was some mistake, and they were much better than I had heard. I observed that I had heard, by men whom I took to be men of veracity, that every one of them was extremely wicked and corrupt at heart—deserved the worst punishment for every thing they did, and during the last year, had done *every thing* which they *ought not*, and had left undone, *every thing* which they *ought to have done*—and deserved to be cut off from the earth and sent to hell, to weep and wail with devils and damned spirits, &c. My friends replied that the stories were doubtless false—that they were well acquainted with the Baptists, and knew many of them to be pious people;—and demanded my authors. After hesitating a moment, I told them that I heard the Baptists themselves tell the Lord of their conduct, and they said they were in earnest. But I immediately added, that I believed it was *more a matter of form* than otherwise, and that more than one half of their deeds, for the last year, had been virtuous, in the eyes of God and man. So that instead of misrepresenting them, by making them worse than they are, I intended to show, that I had a better opinion of them, than they had of themselves.

Dr. P.—Well, that amounts to what I said. It shows that you did not feel as they did, and wished to make unfavorable remarks.

Mr. S.—Do you say, sir, that by representing them as unfortunate in the use of language, and as being better than they say they are, is misrepresenting them to their disadvantage? If that is the case, I must be condemned for misrepresentation; for I still persist in saying, that I do not believe they are half so wicked as they pretend, but are a pious people, and would be highly offended with me, if I should give them the character which they gave themselves.

Dr. P.—Well, Mr. Streeter, as I said before, your observations amount to what I stated, and show that your feelings are not like ours. Had I been there, I could

*heartily have joined with them, as I feel myself as sinful, as they confessed they were. I am sensible that I am guilty of all which they could acknowledge, and deserve to be cast off forever, for the best deeds I perform. So that your feelings and mine are entirely different.*

Mr. S.—And do you mean, Dr. Payson, as your words import, that you are a *very sinful, wicked man*, and deserve to be sent to hell forever? Would you wish me to consider you such a man, and represent you so to others?

Dr. P.—Yes, indeed I do.

Mr. S.—Very well, sir; I will so understand you; and hereafter consider you as wicked and corrupt as you profess to be. If I take you according to your own words, I hope you will not accuse me of misrepresentation. If I was unfavorable to the Baptists, in representing them better than they are, I hope you will acknowledge that I do you justice, when I look upon you, to be just as wicked, as *you say you are.*

#### REFLECTIONS.

We should not have given publicity to the foregoing singular occurrence, were it not deemed indispensable, in justice to both parties, by reason of the numberless falsehoods, and perversions of facts, which have been, and would probably continue to be, circulated, concerning it. Though we cannot expect to prevent all prevarications and misrepresentations, among those whose superstition and bigotry allow them to see only one side of a subject, and, who would probably shudder on taking up a pamphlet, which was published by a Universalist, still, we hope to present facts in such a connexion, that all candid and liberal readers will be able to form a correct opinion of the merits of the case. To such, and such only, we offer these reflections.

We have stated nothing but truths; and truths are stubborn things. Nothing of importance has been omitted, which concerns the conversation between Dr. Payson and myself.

After I made the last reply to the Doctor, some of his friends and Rev. Mr. Taylor made some remarks, which it is unnecessary to relate. They appeared to be friendly and wished me no hurt, but said they prayed for my salvation, &c.



Having frequently and prayerfully reflected on the Doctor's conduct, I am led to abide by my first conclusion, viz : "*To ERR is human ; to FORGIVE, divine.*" I do, in my heart, forgive my brother his trespass against me, and wish him all the health of body and mind, which our common Benefactor may deign to vouchsafe. I fervently pray that he may so conduct, as to enjoy the approbation of a good conscience, exhibit towards others the same disposition which he would approve in them, that when he is called to his death-bed, his dear bosom may not bleed with anguish, by the recollection of offences against his friends, "unrepented of, unreprieved." And at some distant period, when his active and useful life is finished, may the Great Shepherd and Bishop of Souls receive him to the joys of the heavenly City, to unite with all restored sinners, in ascriptions of praise to God, who hath saved us by the blood of the Lamb. Amen.

In our reflections and remarks on the Doctor's conduct, and in requesting an explanation of his allegations and insinuations, we would not by any means be understood, as exhibiting any hostility against him, or any disposition to detract from his virtues and christian graces, or to shoot the least arrow at his fame, beyond what his own language justifies ; and none but those "who worship and serve the creature more than the Creator," will consider it presumptuous for us to remark on his doings, and declare his errors, *as a man*. Should any tears be shed because we cannot revere him as super-human, and confess that "his vices are better than other people's virtues," and should any *pious indignation* be raised on the account, we have but one prayer to offer, viz : Father, forgive them *also*, for they know not what they do.

1. We are very sorry to hear that several of Dr. Payson's friends have assigned so many different reasons for his treatment towards me, since, if what *they say* be true, it is certain, that what *he said* was untrue. As their contradictory stories cannot all be just, I am inclined to give the preference to the Doctor, and consider all the rest as false. For them to say, I had previously offended him,—that I went to the pew that morning, knowing he was in it,—that *he happened* to have his arm on the door,—that he is short-

sighted, and did not see me,—or was so engaged in looking out a hymn, that he did not notice me,—or that he is a man of *quick passions* and spoke before he thought,—that I never had been invited to sit in that pew, &c. is surely false, if what Mr. Payson said be true ; at least, most of them are. We do seriously advise them to consider, that “he is of age, and can speak for himself.”

2. Has not the Doctor accused me of crimes worse than *fratricide* and *patricide* ? Had I murdered my parents and brothers, my hands would be stained with *human-blood*. But he judges me guilty of the bloodshed of *immortal souls*, and sees the *stain* of their blood on my hands ! Now comes the test. I do, in the presence of God, and angels, with one *hand on my breast* while I write, plead, NOT GUILTY ; and challenge him to prove that such *stains* are, or were, on my hands. Either I am guilty of *perjury in essence*, or he is an unjust accuser of his brother. If he refuses to come forward, and show wherein I have *been guilty of shedding the blood of immortal souls*, he must adjust the account with the Public, his Conscience and his God. This truth is as plain, as if penned in sun-beams : viz. If I am the man whom he describes, *he* ought to prove it to the world, that every creature may shun me, as worse than a Robetspierre ; but, if he has no evidence to support his judgment, *he* is wholly unworthy of all confidence, till he makes a public acknowledgement of his high allegation.—Christian reader, bring the matter to a point. If Dr. Payson had said, he believed my hands were stained with the blood of my *father and mother*, is he not bound by every obligation of reason, humanity, justice and religion to produce his evidence, when required ? And is he excused when, *infinitely worse* ! he judges me guilty of immortal blood ; the blood of immortal souls ? Could we impanel a Jury of Angels, I would cheerfully submit the question to their decision. Bring it home to yourself, my dear friend, and see if you would put confidence in a man, whose prejudice or passion would lead him to such rash judgment, and would not produce his proof, or acknowledge his fault. I have no disposition to retort on the Doctor, in the animadversion of Paul, “Thou art inexcusable. O man, whosoever thou art, *that judgest*,” but ask him to



come forward, like an ingenuous antagonist, and present his best evidence, in support of a charge which "beggars all description."

3. The application of the passage from Ezekiel was unmannerly and disingenuous. *I* could also *point my finger at him*, and say, *you* make the hearts of the righteous sad, &c. and with as much propriety as he did. That language was addressed to Prophets, or regular Priests, in Israel, who deceived the righteous by their pretended Orthodoxy, and made their hearts sad, by leading them into transgressions. After they made the people wicked or idolatrous, they strengthened their hands by promising them life in that wickedness; not, *by preaching salvation through the blood of Christ*. Does not the subject apply to Dr. Payson, as well as Mr. Streeter? *He* contends that God will give eternal life to all whom he saves by his grace, and *I* contend that he has given eternal life to all whom he will save? and that he says he will have *all men* to be saved. Then how does he make out that *I* promise life to the wicked, any more than he does? If it be not promising life to a *few* wicked men, to maintain that the Lord Jesus *will redeem* that few, why does it promise life to *all other* wicked men, by maintaining that he *will also redeem* them? Does any reader believe that a man would be encouraged to sin, by being assured that he would be brought to *immediate* punishment? Judicious legislators affix a penalty to the violation of laws, which *would* be sufficient to prevent its commission, on supposition, that the transgressor *believed* he shall be detected and suffer for his deed. Now if he does not believe he shall be detected and punished, what is the difference, whether the penalty be greater or smaller? Hence it is evident that the *certainty* of punishment is more influential, than its *duration*, where all is uncertainty. Now, unless *I* preach a punishment for sin, which is incredible and unreasonable, or which would not prevent it, admitting the people believed it was certain to be inflicted, Dr. Payson's allegation is unjust and untrue. And if he is a man or a christian, he will exhibit his proof, that *I* either strengthen the hands of the wicked, or promise them life, any more than he does. Did Jesus strengthen wicked hands, when he said he came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance?

4. Will Dr. Payson argue that his doctrine of total depravity, personal election and reprobation, saints perseverance and endless misery, have a more salutary influence than the sentiments of the *Merciful Doctors*? Let us compare his people with others, or rather, suppose they were all as good as himself; which is saying great things.—Then, what effect does it have on him? Look at his own words. It leads him to do *every thing* which he *ought not*. He *ought not* falsely accuse a fellow-creature—he *ought not* commit sacrilege—*ought not* assert things he cannot prove—*ought not* be a very wicked and sinful man—*ought not* so conduct as to deserve the pains of hell forever! *All these things* his doctrine encourages *him to do*, with the promise that he shall finally see life. Now suppose all his Church do as well, and do every thing which the Book says, “Thou shalt *not* do,” must it not be that his doctrine is remarkably influential? If they are not thus sinful, and yet say they are, does it not lead to untruths? Unless the Doctor is as wicked as he wished to be considered, he will come forward, and support his charges, or confess his error. If he does neither, we must conclude that *he* has the promise of life, in doing many things which he ought not, and leaving undone, what he ought to have done; or that he had rather do a neighbor and a friend injustice, and have no promise of life, than to do as he would be done by, and enjoy it. Let us turn the table for a moment. Suppose I had shut him out of a pew, in which I knew he was invited to sit, and in which he frequently had sat, and as an apology, should accuse him of the worst of crimes and of preaching a doctrine which encouraged wickedness and shed the blood of immortal souls! Would he not have a right to demand an explanation? and ought I ever to be looked upon as an honest man, if I refused to grant it?

5. Dr. Payson's observations were altogether inconsistent with his Creed. He is a Calvinist in the proper sense of the word, and holds that God determined to save a certain number of individuals, whom he will save, and that none of that number can be finally lost. He does not believe that any man can save himself, or prevent the accomplishment of the divine purpose, in saving that *elected number*. When he publishes a contradiction of this, I will



publish an acknowledgement. But he will not do it.—Hence the intellects of every one should be considered weak, that cannot see, that he does not believe that any the *less* will be saved, or *more* lost, for my preaching. If God saves all his *elect*, I can do *them* no harm ; and as for others, his Creed does not make it barely possible for them to be saved. The Doctor can indirectly contradict these things in the desk, and in conversation ; but he is too prudent to let any thing of the kind be seen in print, with his signature.

I should be glad to know what Dr. Payson means by saying that I am in the most dangerous situation of any man in town. Does he think *his God* will do worse by me, than to make me as miserable to all eternity, as is possible ? If he does not, I am in no worse condition than *all the reprobates*.

Has the Doctor such a degraded opinion of my understanding, as to suppose I am so easily panic-struck as to be frightened lest I should be *more than once* endlessly miserable ? Do I not know as well as his Doctorship, that if his own nearest and dearest relatives were not included in the Covenant of grace, their condition will be as awful as mine, “ages of hopeless end ?” If the works of all unregenerate men are infinitely sinful, why shall one suffer more than others ? Yea, reader, if, as Dr. Payson has positively asserted, all men, even Patriarchs and Apostles, would be condemned and cast off forever, if they were judged and rewarded according to their works, and the only hope they can have is, that they will not be called into judgment ; I say, if all this be true, do not I stand on as good ground as the best of them ? Can I deserve worse than they do, according to his belief ? The Doctor must suppose I am ignorant of his Creed and preaching, and do not know that if the God whom he worships appointed me to that *hapless doom*, we ought to “ascribe righteousness to our Maker,” as his determinate counsel is irrevocable.—Whether he holds, with *Calvin*, that God foreordained the endless suffering of the *non-elect*, because it was his *sovereign will*, or with *Hopkins*, imputes that foreordination “to universal benevolence, or a supreme regard to the highest good of the universe,” is wholly immaterial. The

naked truth is, if I am one of *their* reprobates, there is not even a possibility of my being saved ; and for the Doctor to pretend the contrary, is, to renounce his darling Calvinism, for which he has contended for years, or offer an insult to the lowest capacity. But admitting he was in earnest in what he said, did he show himself "gentle unto all men, in meekness instructing those who oppose themselves?" II Tim. 11. 24—26. Did he follow *his* example, who condescended "to eat and drink with publicans and sinners?" Instead of saying, "Come unto me *all ye*," &c. does he not say, in substance, Lord, I thank thee that I am not like this Universalist? Heaven be praised that such men do not legislate in this State, and country, nor have the power to bind on others heavy burthens, while our Constitutions so boldly confront the aspirations of priestcraft and tyranny.

Should the Doctor reply or apologize, we shall be happy in presenting it to our readers ; but if he views this publication beneath his notice, and treats it with silent contempt, we shall be at liberty to proclaim to others his declining popularity, without being suspected of wishing to disturb his magisterial tranquility. EDITOR.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE INTELLIGENCER.

REV. SIR—Being a member of the Universalist Church in Roxbury, I will attempt to comply with your late request\* that we would state our reasons for omitting our *peculiar* and *distinguishing tenet* in our DECLARATION OF FAITH. It must be understood, however, that I am not authorized by the other members to speak in their behalf; I can only assign the reasons which induced *me* to advocate that omission.

Before I proceed to those reasons, it may be well to remind your readers, that a *Declaration of Faith* or *Articles of Faith*, or *Creed*, (whatever we call it, for it is all one) as used by all churches, is an instrument which every candidate is obliged to sign or assent to, before he can be admitted. There is an important difference between a simple declaration of faith by individuals, and the formal Declar-

---

\* See page 94. Article, "Another Church."—Ed.



tion of Faith incorporated into the Constitution of a Church ; because, in the former case, the declaration regards only the individual who makes it, and imposes no restrictions on others,—it is simply an acknowledgement and profession of a certain belief ; but in the latter case, the declaration becomes a *test*, by which the church must try every candidate ; so that however virtuous and pious, however worthy as a christian he may be, he is inevitably excluded if the creed contain even one article which he cannot subscribe to.

1. Now, Sir, one reason which induced me to advocate the omission of *all sectarian* sentiments in our Declaration of Faith, is that I think it wrong for a church of Christ to establish such barriers as will inevitably exclude any *christian* from membership ; and therefore, that it ought not to demand of its candidates any other faith than what is necessary in order to constitute them *christians*. I look on a church of Christ as a society simply of christians. I look on christians as its proper members, and as naturally entitled to its privileges, as children of the same family are to the privileges of that family, or as citizens of the same State are to the rights of that State. If this view be correct, it is certainly improper to use a creed which demands *sectarian* qualifications of candidates.

I hope not to undervalue neither those particular truths which are believed and advocated by Universalists, nor other particular truths to which many of almost every denomination arrive by reflection and study. I consider them important ; but I think them misused when they are made the tests of qualification of candidates,—the indispensable conditions of admission into our churches. For instance : the truth taught to Peter, by the vision of all manner of four-footed beasts and creeping things, was one of great importance ; yet it would have been improper to demand St. Peter's assent to it, *as an indispensable condition of admission into the church*, because our Saviour admitted him, and even appointed him to the Apostleship, *long before he did assent to it*.

2. Another reason, which I think ought to have great weight, is the example given by the Apostles. It seems that they demanded of the candidates for the primitive